



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,328	06/17/2002	Norberto A. Guzman	57430-00006	9218

7590 02/27/2006

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
14th Floor
801 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5554

EXAMINER

NOGUEROLA, ALEXANDER STEPHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1753

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10/821,328	6/17/2002	N. Guzman	57430-00006

EXAMINER	
A. Nogueroles	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1753	

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Alex Nogueroles (3) Douglas Larson
(2) Dr. ~~Norberto~~ Guzman (4) _____
Norberto

Date of Interview February 21, 2006

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☒ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, brief description: Dr. Guzman presented several small posters showing embodiments of the claimed invention and improvements to them.

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: proposed new claim 1, which is attached to this Interview Summary.

Identification of prior art discussed: Taylor '692, Wiktorowicz '165, Foote '971, and Guzman '604 of record. Nelson '525

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

With respect to Guzman '604, the examiner stated that there may be double-patenting against proposed claim 1. With respect to Foote '971, the examiner stated that if proposed claim 1 was amended to require the separation capillaries to cross over the transport capillary this would be a patentable distinction. Wiktorowicz '165 discloses

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

Mr. Larson

→ isoelectric focussing in the first dimension. Applicant asserts that isoelectric focussing would not read on "affinity means" as contemplated for the invention of the instant application. Mr. Larson cites original claim 15 to illustrate patentably distinct affinity means. With respect to Nelson '525, Mr. Larson pointed out that proposed claim 1 requires a second separation capillary intersecting the transport capillary.

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, Section 713.04 Substance of Interview must Be Made of Record

Except as otherwise provided, a complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application, whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

§1.133 Interviews

(b) In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111 and 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

§ 1.2. Business to be transacted in writing. All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete a two-sheet carbon interleaf Interview Summary Form for each interview held after January 1, 1978 where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks in neat handwritten form using a ball point pen. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, or resulting in an examiner's amendment that fully sets forth the agreement are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate paper number, placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" list on the file wrapper. In a personal interview, the duplicate copy of the Form is removed and given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephonic interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number of the application
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (personal or telephonic)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the claims discussed
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). (Agreements as to allowability are tentative and do not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.)
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview
- Names of other Patent and Trademark Office personnel present.

The Form also contains a statement reminding the applicant of his responsibility to record the substance of the interview.

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his obligation to record the substance of the interview in each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check a box at the bottom of the Form informing the applicant that he need not supplement the Form by submitting a separate record of the substance of the interview.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview:

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner. The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner,
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete or accurate, the examiner will give the applicant one month from the date of the notifying letter to complete the reply and thereby avoid abandonment of the application (37 CFR 1.135(c)).

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

Applicant's summary of what took place at the interview should be carefully checked to determine the accuracy of any argument or statement attributed to the examiner during the interview. If there is an inaccuracy and it bears directly on the question of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth his or her version of the statement attributed to him. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication "Interview record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Title: MULTI-DIMENSIONAL ELECTROPHORESIS
APPARATUS
U.S. Serial No: 10/821,328
SSD Ref: 57430-00006

PROPOSED CLAIM FOR INTERVIEW WITH EXAMINER NOGUEROLA

I. (New) An electrophoresis apparatus, comprising:

a transport capillary having a sample inlet end and an outlet end;

a first separation capillary in fluid communication with and intersecting the transport capillary at a first intersection;

an inlet end of the first separation capillary being positionable in fluid communication with a buffer supply;

first affinity means for attracting and concentrating in the first intersection a first analyte of interest from a sample introduced into the transport capillary and allowing the concentrated first analyte of interest to be subsequently conveyed via the first separation capillary to a detector which identifies and characterizes analytes of interest;

a second separation capillary in fluid communication with and intersecting the transport capillary at a second intersection downstream of the first intersection;

an inlet end of the second separation capillary being positionable in fluid communication with a buffer supply; and

second affinity means for attracting and concentrating in the second intersection a second analyte of interest from the introduced sample and allowing the concentrated

Title: MULTI-DIMENSIONAL ELECTROPHORESIS
APPARATUS

U.S. Serial No: 10/821,328

SSD Ref. 57430-00006

second analyte of interest to be subsequently conveyed by at least electrophoresis migration via the second separation capillary to the detector.